



**You have downloaded a document from
RE-BUS
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice**

Title: Contrasting different morphosyntactic choices in English and Polish noun phrases

Author: Bożena Cetnarowska

Citation style: Cetnarowska Bożena. (2016). Contrasting different morphosyntactic choices in English and Polish noun phrases. W: B. Cetnarowska, M. Kuczok, M. Zabawa (red.), "Various dimensions of contrastive studies" (s. 70-85). Katowice : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.



Uznanie autorstwa - Użycie niekomercyjne - Bez utworów zależnych Polska - Licencja ta zezwala na rozpowszechnianie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie w celach niekomercyjnych oraz pod warunkiem zachowania go w oryginalnej postaci (nie tworzenia utworów zależnych).



UNIwersytet ŚLĄSKI
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Chapter 4

Contrasting different morphosyntactic choices in English and Polish noun phrases

Bożena Cetnarowska

University of Silesia in Katowice

This chapter compares patterns of pre- and post-modification of head nouns in Polish and English noun phrases. The discussion focuses on event nominals and their nominal or adjectival satellites, such as post-head genitives, possessives and relational adjectives. Illustrative examples are given of morphological and morphosyntactic restrictions which constrain the choices available in both languages. The influence of information structure and stylistic factors on the linearization of satellites of head nouns is also discussed briefly.

Key words: noun phrase, event nominals, relational adjectives, genitives

4.1 Introduction

The chapter aims to contrast morphosyntactic options available in the case of noun phrases denoting events in English and Polish.

The syntax and semantics of event nominals have been discussed extensively in the literature, especially in formal approaches to morphosyntax (see Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou 2007; Alexiadou and Rathert (eds.) 2010; Rathert and Alexiadou (eds.) 2010; Borer 2005; Rozwadowska 2005; among others). The internal syntax of event nominals is often contrasted with the realization of argument structure in verb phrases. Moreover, cross-linguistic comparison can be found of derived nominals, see for instance Alexiadou, Haegeman, and Stavrou (2007). Polish and English nominals are discussed by Rozwadowska (1997),

Willim (1999), and Bloch-Trojnar (2013). However, the above-mentioned works devote relatively little attention to the question of the competition between various ways of expressing a subject-type or an object-like satellite¹ in an event nominal corresponding to a particular clause. This will be the main focus of the present chapter.

The layout of the chapter is as follows. Section 4.2 starts with general remarks on the realization of arguments (or satellites) in English event nominals. Then the syntactic choices made by speakers are contrasted in two cases: nominals headed by the noun *arrival* and *visit*. Examples are provided from the English language corpus (COCA)² as well as from Google searches to illustrate the occurrence of post-head genitives, pre-head genitives, and relational adjectives as syntactic realizations of arguments of the (verbal base underlying) the noun *arrival* and *visit*. Section 4.3 begins with a short discussion of ways of realizing arguments of derived nominals in Polish. Then two types of nominals are analyzed (on the basis of data from the NKJP corpus³): those headed by the event noun *przyjazd* ‘arrival’ and by the noun *wizyta* ‘visit’.

Conclusions are offered in Section 4.4.

4.2 Event nominals in English

4.2.1 The linearization patterns in English noun phrases

The discussion of the structure of noun phrases headed by event nouns in English involves a number of controversial issues. One of them is the question whether nouns are able to take arguments. The traditional approach to noun phrases adopts the view that satellites accompanying nouns are optional hence they must be regarded as modifiers and not as arguments (see Huddleston 1984). A different view is defended by Grimshaw (1990), Borer (2005) and a number of researchers who adopt a syntactic approach to derived nominals (see Alexiadou, Hae-

¹ Rainer (2013) adopts the onomasiological perspective to discuss the contrast between adjectival and nominal modifiers (i.e., N+N and A+N sequences) cross-linguistically. Cetnarowska (2005) discusses the choice between genitives and possessives in event nominals in Polish and English.

² The Corpus of Contemporary American English is available on-line at corpus.byu.edu/coca.

³ The National Corpus of Polish (Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego) is available on-line at www.nkjp.pl.

geman and Stavrou 2007; or the chapters in the volume by Alexiadou and Rathert (eds.) 2010).

Grimshaw (1990) contrasts two types of nominals headed by deverbal nouns: so-called complex event nominals and result nominals in English. Result nominals denote objects or abstract entities involved in or resulting from a particular eventuality, e.g., *building*, *assignment*, *signature*, *proposal*. They are not able to take arguments. They can appear with optional satellites which have the status of modifiers or complements.

- (1) a. *The new building was completely destroyed in the fire.*
 b. *The assumption that the earth is flat was widely held in the Middle Ages.*
 c. *Your assumption that the earth is flat cannot be proved.*

Complex event nominals are associated with argument structure and event structure. The phrase *of the pyramids* is regarded by Grimshaw (1990) as the internal argument⁴ of the complex event noun *building* in (2a), just as the NP *the pyramids* is the internal argument (i.e., the direct object) of the verb *build* in (2b).

- (2) a. *The building of the great pyramids by the ancient Egyptians took several centuries and required the use of novel engineering methods.*
 b. *The ancient Egyptians built great pyramids.*

Grimshaw (1990) suggests that some event nouns are not associated with any argument structure, e.g., *trip*, *race*, *journey*, *exam*. They are treated as names of simple events. According to Grimshaw (1990) and Alexiadou and Grimshaw (2008), simple event nominals and result nominals jointly form a group of referential nominals, i.e., nominals which are not argument-supporting ones. The PPs *to Hawaii* and *through the old Jungle Habitat park* are treated as modifiers (which are optional, in contrast to arguments).

- (3) a. *our first trip to Hawaii*
 b. *the race through the old Jungle Habitat park will be run on a 6,5 mile loop*

⁴ Internal arguments of transitive nominals can also be realized as pre-head possessives in so-called passive nominals, e.g., *the city's destruction by the enemy*. Grimshaw (1990) regards passive nominals as simple event nominals (but see Cetnarowska 2005 for some counterarguments to this view). Synthetic compounds such as *pyramid building* and *beer drinking* exemplify another option of nominalizing a transitive predicate.

As far as intransitive nominals, such as *escape* and *talking* in (4), are concerned, Grimshaw (1990) does not treat them as argument-taking. She assumes that the occurrence of internal arguments is one of the indications of the complex event status of derived nominals. However, there is some cross-linguistic evidence (see Rozwadowska 2005) supporting the claim that intransitive nominals exhibit properties of complex event nominals, thus they are able to support arguments. The external argument of English transitive or intransitive nominals can be realized syntactically in various ways⁵, as illustrated in (4). It can appear as a pre-head possessive, i.e., Saxon genitive (in 4a), as a post-head genitive (in 4b), a relational adjective (in 4c), a *by*-phrase (in 4d), or as a nominal modifier forming part of a N+N compound (in 4e). The relational adjective *governmental* in (4c) can be regarded as a thematic one (Bosque and Picallo 1996), i.e., as saturating the Agent theta-role assigned by the predicate *attempt*.

- (4) a. *women's fight for the vote*
 b. *the fight of women to choose whether or not to wear the burqa* (COCA)
 c. *Governmental Attempts to Achieve Self-Sufficiency in Rice Production in the Phillipines.* (<http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/agscudas/184393.htm>)
 d. *Talking by students was not the norm. In fact, students were punished for talking in class, even if the talk was academic!* (<http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/108035/chapters/Why-Talk-Is-Important-in-Classrooms.aspx>)
 d. *Emma McDonald explains how to manage student talking without stifling creativity and collaborative learning.* (https://www.google.pl/search?q=talking+by+students&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&gws_rd=cr&ei=A_BBVqKkBuPgywOj6KbgBQ)

There are morphological and morphosyntactic constraints regulating the usage of each of the abovementioned syntactic realizations of the subject-type participant⁶. The choice between Saxon genitives and

⁵ Grimshaw (1990) assumes that the external argument is suppressed in nominalizations (similarly to the suppression of the external argument in passivization). Therefore, she regards Saxon genitives, post-head genitives (with the subjective reading), *by*-phrases, and relational adjectives as argument adjuncts (which do not saturate argument positions), not as true arguments. However, some researchers argue that derived nominals are possible with true external arguments (e.g., Cornilescu 2001).

⁶ I will not discuss here differences which may be discerned between the semantic interpretation of some roughly synonymous noun phrases. For instance, the relational adjective *gladiatorial* in the phrase *the gladiatorial contest* exhibits the plural (or "group") reading.

of-phrase genitives is discussed at length by, among others, Altenberg (1982), Jucker (1993), Taylor (1996), Anschutz (1997), and Rosenbach (2005). They point out that the noun phrase which appears as the “possessor” in the Saxon genitive construction (i.e., as *X* in the *X*’s *Y* construction) should preferably be a personal noun or an animate noun. It should also be inherently salient and topic-worthy⁷. Participants with the Agent role are generally more appropriate in the pre-head position. An additional factor is the length and syntactic complexity of the possessor nominals, since the pre-head genitive is more appropriate as the location for short and syntactically “light” nominals.

The usage of *by*-phrases to express the external argument (i.e., subject-type participant) is typical of transitive nominals. It is additionally possible in result nominals when the *by*-phrase denotes “authorship”, e.g., *a book by Chomsky* (see Rozwadowska 2005, 1997).

Relational adjectives are not particularly frequent as realizations of arguments in English derived nominals. As noted by, among others, Szymanek (1985) and Rainer (2013), the derivation of relational adjectives in English is an unproductive process and involves many lexical gaps, such as the lack of the relational adjective from *police*, *student*, *widow*, and numerous other nouns. Relational adjectives in English are often borrowings from Romance languages, e.g., *royal*, *military*, and *civic*.

N+N compounds with the subject-orientation of the left-hand element are discussed by Lieber (2009), e.g., *caribou migration*, *court ruling*, *government collapse*. Lieber (2009) observes that it is difficult to find N+N compounds of this type where the modifier represents the subject argument of the underlying verb. She adds that language users tend to interpret the left-hand constituent as denoting the internal argument, as in *robot repair* (which is ambiguous between the interpretation ‘repair by a robot’ and ‘repair of robots’).

4.2.2 The intransitive nominal arrival

This section discusses linearization patterns in English NPs which correspond to the clause *The president arrived (in Cairo)*. The verb *arrive* is intransitive and its single argument is an animate (personal) entity, thus this argument is expected to surface in the corresponding nominalization as the Saxon genitive, i.e., *the President’s arrival*. It needs to

⁷ Taylor (1996: 18) defines topic-worthiness as “the cognitive accessibility of a concept”. It is determined either by the discourse-conditioned topicality or the inherent topicality of a given entity.

be added, though, that *arrive* is an unaccusative verb whose argument bears the role of Theme/Patient, thus the post-head *of*-phrase genitive is also a likely position for this argument in the event nominal *the arrival of the President*.

The inspection of COCA reveals that there are 25 occurrences of the pre-head genitive NP in *the president's arrival* and 7 instances of the post-head genitive in *the arrival of (the) president*.

Some examples of Saxon genitives, selected from the COCA corpus, are given below in (5).

- (5) a. *And as people are picking up the pieces, they're expecting the president's arrival tomorrow.*
 b. *the optimism we'd been feeling since the President's arrival*
 c. *What's been the reaction, Elaine, to the president's arrival?*
 d. *waiting to get a front-row seat for the former president's arrival here in Harlem*
 e. *the promise of a new president's arrival*

The overwhelming majority of the pre-head possessor nominals in the phrases headed by *arrival* in COCA contain no pre- or postmodifiers, i.e., they consist of the unmodified noun *president*. This makes them particularly felicitous in the pre-head position in event nominals. Two instances (out of 25 found in COCA), given here as (5d, 5e), are possessor nominals with a premodifying adjective (*former*, *new*). The possessor nominals are definite (except for 5e), as they have unique reference and denote individuals who are easily recognizable. This is emphasized in some NPs by the capitalization of the word *President* (as in 5b). The inspection of a wider linguistic context of those NPs shows that the possessor nominals are often discourse-linked. The sentence (5c) occurs in the middle of the paragraph which contains the previous mention of a specific president, i.e., President Bush⁸.

Let us now consider three (out of seven) cases of the post-head genitives culled from COCA and given in (6).

- (6) a. *Of course, seven, I guess now eight world leaders, with the arrival of President Yeltsin of Russia, are meeting in Halifax, Nova Scotia.*
 b. *We're only a moment or two away from the arrival of President Shepherd and his State of the Union address.*
 c. *he, the Second Vice President Samar, and the Cabinet awaited the arrival of President Mikaso in the presidential conference chamber*

⁸ The paragraph in question contains the sentence: *In the meantime, President Bush is also looking to secure support from the European community when it comes to Iraq.*

The possessor nominals in (6b, 6c) contain two constituents, i.e., *President Shepherd* and *President Mikado*. The possessor nominal in (6a) is syntactically “heavy” as it contains the postmodifying phrase *of Russia*. Additionally, the post-head position for the possessor in (6a) is compatible with its conveying new information, rather than given information (“now eight with the arrival of President Yeltsin of Russia”). The usage of the *of*-phrase to introduce the phrase *President Shepherd* places the possessor nominal closer to (and, consequently, makes it more accessible as the antecedent for) the possessive pronoun *his*.

A hypothetical N+N compound *?*president arrival* sounds infelicitous and is not found in the corpus⁹. Moreover, the COCA corpus contains no occurrences of the event nominal *presidential arrival*, with the subject-type argument expressed as a relational adjective. Google searches reveal, however, some examples of the event nominal in question.

- (7) a. *Presidential Arrival in Philadelphia. After President Obama arrived via Air Force One at Philadelphia International Airport he was seen talking with Senator Bob Casey.* (www.c-span.org/video/?326110.../presidential-arrival)
 b. *Best Presidential Arrival Ever #Fiat #holyrider* (Shay Shay on Twitter)
 c. *Tweed busy ahead of presidential arrival* (<http://wtnh.com/2014/10/14/tweed-busy-ahead-of-presidential-arrival/>)

It is characteristic that the relational adjective *presidential* appears in the headlines of news reports or Twitter feeds. Its usage can result from the need for economy of expression, and the topic-worthiness of the possessor noun *President*, from which the relational adjective is derived.

4.2.3 The nominal headed by the noun visit

This section contains an analysis of nominals corresponding to the clause *The pope visited (X)*. The verb *to visit* is transitive, yet the deverbal event noun *visit* does not appear with the subject-type Saxon genitive and the object-type *of*-phrase, contrary to what would be expected of a transitive nominal, cf. *?*the pope's visit of Cuba*. The direct object of

⁹ A Google search has brought the compound (or the compound-like juxtaposition) *Obama arrival* in the sentence *Brisk business ahead of Obama arrival in Kenya*, <http://www.businessdailyafrica.com/Brisk-business-ahead-of-Obama-arrival-in-Kenya/-/1248928/2777492/-/gc4ytp/-/index.html>.

the transitive verb *visit* can be syntactically realized as an adjunct, i.e. a prepositional phrase with a locative reading. As shown by the examples culled from COCA and given in (8), the locative phrase is usually introduced by the preposition *to* (indicating direction), less commonly it is the prepositional phrase headed by the preposition *in* (as in 9).

- (8) a. *We have those stories and an update on the Pope's visit to Cuba.*
 b. *the unexpectedly large crowds during the pope's visit to France in August*
 c. *after the January visit of Pope John Paul II to Cuba*
 d. *The controversy has heated up as the visit by the pope to the Holy Land approaches.*
- (9) *A lot has changed since then and chief national correspondent Byron Pitts is covering the papal visit in Santiago, Cuba.*

The subject of the clause *The pope visited (Cuba/France/the Holy Land)* has several possible realizations in the corresponding nominals, as is indicated by (8–9) and by the examples in (10–12). It can surface as a pre-head possessive (as in 8a), a post-head *of*-phrase (8c), a *by*-phrase (8d) or a relational adjective (in 9). There are no instances of nominal modifiers, i.e., **pope visit*. The most common linearization variant (75 instances in COCA) is the Saxon genitive, i.e., *(the) pope's visit*. The pre-head position is predictable, given the animacy of the noun *Pope*, its subjective interpretation, and the agentive role it carries. Moreover, the noun phrase is definite, as is indicated by the definite article or by the capitalization of the noun *Pope*. It can additionally be discourse-linked, as shown in (10a), which is again felicitous with its pre-head position¹⁰ (cf. Taylor 1996).

- (10) a. *In Havana today, Pope Benedict had a one-on-one meeting with a former altar boy. (...) With the Pope's visit, some Americans are having a Havana homecoming.*
 b. *The pope's visit is limited to Kraków, but Poles have come from all over Poland – come to see and cheer him on.*
 c. *And he wanted to talk about how excited he was about the pope's visit.*

The post-head genitive with the subjective reading, i.e., *the visit of Pope/the visit of the pope*, is far less common (16 instances). In (11a) it occurs since the possessor nominal is “heavy”, due to the presence of the appositional construction *Pope John Paul II*.

¹⁰ An extra factor involved in here may be the style of the excerpts. Forty-two out of 75 instances of *the pope's visit* in COCA exemplify the spoken genre.

- (11) a. *the trade embargo could end as soon as next year with the scheduled visit of Pope John Paul II*
 b. *Concerning the visit of the Pope, there is no agreement as to the possible date.*

There are no instances of post-head genitive phrases which show the objective reading and follow the event noun *visit* in the corpus (in the nominalizations of the sentence *The pope visited Y*). That such a usage is not totally impossible is indicated by (12), which comes from a Google search.

- (12) *visit of Old Delhi with Masterji Kee Haveli – Indian lunch*

The potential ambiguity of a post-head genitive can account for the usage of a *by*-phrase to express the agent (5 instances of *visit by (the) Pope* in COCA), as in (13).

- (13) a. *The controversy has heated up as the visit by the pope to the Holy Land approaches.*
 b. *to help promote next week's visit by Pope John Paul II*

A notably common realization (51 instances in the corpus)¹¹ of the subject-type satellite in the nominal under consideration is the relational adjective *papal*. The group adjective signals unambiguously the agentive reading of the base noun *pope*.

- (14) a. *The Papal visit was greeted with great enthusiasm and generated a sense of national euphori.*
 b. *Commentators observe that the papal visit has much improved Lima's streets.*
 c. *The controversy has marred preparations for the Jan. 20–21 papal visit to the Indian Ocean island.*

It needs to be added that while the relational adjective *papal* can be treated as a thematic adjective in (14) (since it can be treated as saturating the Agent theta-role of the underlying predicate *visit*), it has the status of a classificatory adjective in (15) and co-occurs with a referential expression, such as the possessive pronoun *his* or the Saxon genitive *Benedict XVI's*. *Papal visit* in (15) can be paraphrased as 'visit as a pope'.

¹¹ It is notable that the majority of those examples (of *papal visit*) can be found in news reports, periodicals and academic books.

- (15) a. *the focal point of Benedict XVI's papal visit to Britain later this month*
 b. *while en route to his first papal visit to Africa*

An additional issue to be considered is the status of the nominals headed by *visit* as an argument-supporting or non-argument supporting ones. The noun *visit* can be derived from the corresponding verb by means of conversion (zero-derivation). Zero-derived nouns are regarded by Grimshaw (1990) and Alexiadou and Grimshaw (2008), among others, as names of simple events. While doubts can be raised against the assumption that all zero-derived nouns in English are simple event nouns (see Bloch-Trojnar 2013 for some criticism), nominals headed by the noun *visit* do indeed behave like nominals which lack argument structure.

4.3 Polish noun phrases

4.3.1 Syntactic realization of participants in Polish event nominals

When Polish deverbal event nominals occur with two satellites, the internal argument is characteristically expressed as an adnominal genitive and the external argument as an agentive *przez*-phrase¹² (Rozwadowska 1997, Willim 1999).

- (16) *sprzedaż samochodu przez Jana*
 sale.NOM car.GEN by Jan
 'the sale of the car by John'

The post-head genitive can also exhibit a subjective interpretation when the event nominal is derived from an intransitive verb, as in (17a), or when it calls for a result reading (in 17b).

- (17) a. *upadek Rzymu*
 fall.NOM Rome.GEN
 'the fall of Rome'
 b. *kolekcja Diora*
 collection.NOM Dior.GEN
 '(Christian) Dior's (couture) collection'

¹² When the external argument is a pronominal element, it can surface as a pre-head possessive pronoun (see Topolińska 1984). This may be stylistically marked or may indicate the speaker's emotion, as in *Jego krojenie chleba nożem do mięsa bardzo mnie denerwuje* 'His cutting bread with a carving knife is getting on my nerves'.

The external argument can alternatively be realized in a nominalization as a relational adjective, as in (18a, 18b)¹³. In rare cases, as in (18c), denominal adjectives refer to the internal argument.

- (18) a. *nauczycielski strajk*
 teacher.ADJ strike
 ‘a teachers’ strike’
 b. *atak terrorystyczny*
 attack.NOM terrorist.ADJ
 ‘a terrorist attack’
 c. *reformy gospodarcze*
 reforms.NOM economic
 ‘economic reforms’

In the next section the satellites accompanying the Polish event noun *przyjazd* ‘arrival’ will be discussed, since it is an equivalent of the English event noun *arrival* investigated in Section 4.2.2.

4.3.2 The nominal *przyjazd* ‘arrival’

The search of the NKJP Pelcra corpus¹⁴ shows that there are 51 occurrences of the phrase *przyjazd prezydenta* (with the post-head genitive), and further 57 examples of inflected forms of this nominal, e.g., *przyjazdem prezydenta* (lit. arrival.INS president.GEN)

Some illustrative examples are given below:

- (19) a. *Liczymy na przyjazd prezydenta Lecha Kaczyńskiego do Izraela.*
 count.1PL on arrival.ACC president.GEN Lech.GEN Kaczyński.GEN to Israel
 ‘We count on the arrival of President Lech Kaczyński in Israel.’
 b. *Przyjazd prezydenta USA do Trynidadu i Tobago*
 arrival.NOM president.GEN USA.GEN to Trinidad.GEN and Tobago.GEN
 ‘the arrival of the president of the USA in Trinidad and Tobago’

Neither the phrase *prezydencki przyjazd* ‘presidential arrival’ nor *przyjazd prezydencki* (lit. arrival presidential) is attested in the NKJP corpus. The Google search did not bring any examples of this phrase, although the morphologically related deverbal noun *wyjazd* ‘departure, trip’ is attested with the premodifying relational adjective *prezydencki* (in 20a). The event noun *przyjazd* ‘arrival’ can be modified by other relational

¹³ Let us add that the status of the relational adjective as an argumental element in Polish is controversial. Willim (1999) and Rozwadowska (1997) assume that a denominal adjective has the status of a modifier in a noun phrase.

¹⁴ The searches were carried out on November 9–10, 2015.

adjectives with the subjective interpretation, as in the phrase *papieski przyjazd* ‘papal arrival’ in (20b), found in the NKJP.

- (20) a. *Ile kosztował prezydencki wyjazd do Katowic?*
 how much cost.PST.3SG presidential trip.NOM to Katowice
 ‘How much did the president’s trip to Katowice cost?’
 (<http://www.ino-online.pl/n.php?wiadomosc=20829&r=1>)
 b. *przygotowane na papieski przyjazd dewocjonalia*
 prepared on papal arrival.ACC devotional_articles.NOM
 ‘devotional souvenirs, prepared for the papal arrival’

The next section will consider nominals headed by *wizyta*, which is a Polish equivalent of the English noun *visit* discussed in 4.2.3.

4.3.3 The nominal headed by *wizyta* ‘visit’

Similarly to the English noun *visit*, the Polish noun *wizyta* ‘visit’ appears to be a name of a simple event. In contrast to English, the Polish event noun is not a deverbal nominal. It is a borrowing (from French). The related verb *wizytować* ‘pay a visit’ can be treated as a denominal formation since it shows a narrower range of usage than its nominal base¹⁵.

The most common (447 instances in the NKJP) surface realization of the subject-type satellite of *wizyta* is the post-head genitive. The possessor nominal is either unmodified and capitalized (as in 21a), or it is an appositive construction, as in (21c). The event noun *wizyta* may be accompanied by a locative phrase, e.g., *w Polsce* ‘in Poland’ in (21c), but it tends to be omitted (as in 21a, 21b).

- (21) a. *My chcieliśmy, by wizyta Papieża*
 we want.PST.1PL so-that visit.NOM pope.GEN
odbyła się w maju.
 take-place.FUT.3SG R.CL. in May
 ‘We wanted the Pope’s visit to take place in May’.
 b. *Wizyta papieża już w maju 2003?*
 visit.NOM pope.GEN already in May 2003
 ‘Pope’s visit (scheduled) as early as in May 2003?’
 c. *Pierwsza wizyta papieża Jana Pawła II w Polsce*
 first visit.NOM pope.GEN John.GEN Paul.GEN second.GEN in Poland
 ‘The first visit of Pope John Paul II in Poland’

¹⁵ According to *Słownik języka polskiego PWN* (available on-line at <http://sjp.pwn.pl/sjp>), the verb *wizytować* exhibits two current meanings: ‘to make an inspection in some institution’ and ‘to pay an official visit (e.g., in another country)’.

The usage of the head noun *wizyta* ‘visit’ with the relational adjective *papieski* ‘papal’ is fairly common in the NKJP corpus. There are 84 instances of the A+N word order *papieska wizyta* ‘papal visit’ and 47 examples of the N+A order *wizyta papieska*, as shown in (22) and (23).

- (22) a. *Papieska wizyta bez wiernych.*
 Papal visit.NOM without faithful.GEN.PL
 ‘The papal visit without the faithful’
- b. *Benedykt XVI na Jasnej Górze!*
 Benedict XVI on Luminous Mountain.LOC
Papieska wizyta w Częstochowie
 Papal visit.NOM in Częstochowa
 ‘Benedict XVI in Jasna Góra (Monastery)! The papal visit in Częstochowa’
- c. *Nie będzie to pierwsza papieska wizyta*
 not be.FUT.3SG it first papal visit.NOM
w kraju prawosławnym
 in country.LOC orthodox.LOC
 ‘It will not be the first papal visit to an Eastern Orthodox Christian country’.
- (23) a. *Wizyta papieska na Ukrainie kończy się 27 czerwca*
 visit.NOM papal on Ukraine end.3SG R.CL. 27th June.GEN
na lotnisku we Lwowie.
 on airport.LOC in Lviv
 ‘The papal visit to Ukraine ends on 27th June at Lviv airport’.
- b. *Ile będzie kosztować słowackich podatników*
 how-much be.FUT.3SG cost.INF Slovak tax-payers.ACC
wrześniowa wizyta papieska?
 September.ADJ visit.NOM papal
 ‘What will be the cost of the September papal visit to Slovak taxpayers?’

The post-head position, illustrated in (23), is typical of relational adjectives in Polish (Rutkowski and Progovač 2005), yet thematic adjectives referring to the external (or subject-type) argument of the event noun are likely to be placed preminimally, as noted by Linde-Usiekiewicz (2013) and Cetnarowska (2014). This is confirmed by the predominance of the A+N order, attested in the corpus data for the nominals headed by the event noun *wizyta* ‘visit’. Furthermore, the animacy and the topic-worthiness of the noun *papież* ‘pope’ favour the selection of the pre-head (i.e., more topical) position of the denominal adjective *papieski* ‘papal’. This is important especially in the case of headlines and lead sentences in news articles, such as those in (22a, 22b) (as well as in

the remaining 12 instances of the A+N pattern in the corpus). Thus, stylistic factors additionally influence the choice of the linearization patterns in the event nominals under discussion.

4.4 Conclusions

This chapter aimed to demonstrate that it is useful to look at the internal syntax of deverbal event nominals focusing on the rivalry between alternative linearization patterns. I also intended to show that it is useful to adopt the contrastive perspective and to compare choices available in two (or more) selected languages. The data were culled from two on-line language corpora, i.e., the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP). In the case of the English language corpus, derived nominals were investigated which corresponded to the sentences *The President arrived (in location X)* and *The Pope visited X*. The Polish data included derived nominals corresponding to the sentences *Prezydent przyjechał (do X)* and *Papież odwiedził X*. The comparison of the usage of the Saxon genitive and the *of*-genitive in English nominals confirmed the observations made by other scholars (e.g., Altenberg 1982, Rosenbach 2005, Taylor 1996) on the importance of animacy, syntactic weight, and topic-worthiness in selecting one of those morphosyntactic options. However, I additionally emphasized the possibility of using relational adjectives in English to express the subjective argument of the underlying verb predicate, when such denominal formations are available (e.g., *papal* in *papal visit*). The data from Polish indicate that relational adjectives are fairly common equivalents of adnominal genitives with the subjective interpretation in the case of the nominal *papieska wizyta* ‘papal visit’. The NKJP corpus does not, however, contain any examples of the nominal *prezydencki przyjazd* ‘presidential arrival’, in spite of the availability of the adjective *prezydencki* ‘presidential’. Speakers of Polish who select a relational adjective (rather than an adnominal genitive) in derived nominals make a further choice concerning its pre-head or post-head placement. The choice between linearization variants in Polish (as well as in English) is conditioned by a variety of factors, including the thematic role of the argument, information structure within a nominal and the style of the excerpt.

References

- Alexiadou, A. & J. Grimshaw. 2008. Verbs, nouns and affixation. In *SINSPEC (Working Papers of the SFB 732)* 1. 1–16.
- Alexiadou, A., L. Haegeman & M. Stavrou. 2007. *Noun phrase in the generative perspective*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Alexiadou, A. & M. Rathert (eds.). 2010. *The syntax of nominalizations across languages and frameworks*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Altenberg, B. 1982. *The genitive v. the of-construction: A study of syntactic variation in 17th century English*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Anschutz, A. 1997. How to choose a possessive construction in four easy steps. *Studies in Language* 21(1). 1–35.
- Bloch-Trojnar, M. 2013. *The mechanics of transposition. A study of action nominalisations in English, Irish and Polish*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Borer, H. 2005. *Structuring sense, volume I: In name only*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bosque, I. & C. Picallo. 1996. Postnominal adjectives in Spanish DPs. *Journal of Linguistics* 32. 349–385.
- Cetnarowska, B. 2005. *Passive nominals in English and Polish: An optimality-theoretic analysis*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Cetnarowska, B. 2014. On pre-nominal classifying adjectives in Polish. In A. Bondaruk, G. Dalmi & A. Grosu (eds.), *Advances in the syntax of DPs: Structure, agreement and case*, 221–246. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cornilescu, A. 2001. Romanian nominalizations: case and aspectual structure. *Journal of Linguistics* 37. 467–501.
- Grimshaw, J. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Huddleston, R. 1984. *Introduction to the grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jucker, A. 1993. The genitive versus the of-construction in newspaper language. In A. Jucker (ed.), *The noun phrase in English. Its structure and variation*, 121–136. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Lieber, R. 2009. On the lexical semantics of compounds. Non-affixal (de)verbal compounds. In S. Scalise & I. Vogel (eds.), *Cross-disciplinary issues in compounding*, 127–144. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Linde-Usiekniewicz, J. 2013. A position on classificatory adjectives in Polish. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 8(3). 103–126.
- Rainer, F. 2013. Can relational adjectives really express any relation? An onomasiological perspective. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10(1). 12–40.
- Rathert, M. & A. Alexiadou (eds.). 2010. *The semantics of nominalizations across languages and frameworks*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Rosenbach, A. 2005. Animacy versus weight as determinants of grammatical variation in English. *Language* 81. 613–644.

- Rozwadowska, B. 1997. *Towards a unified theory of nominalizations. External and internal eventualities*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Rozwadowska, B. 2005. Derived nominals. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. II, 24–55. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rutkowski, P. & L. Progovac. 2005. Classification projection in Polish and Serbian: The position and shape of classifying adjectives. In S. Franks, F. Y. Gladney & M. Tasseva-Kurktchieva (eds.), *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The South Carolina meeting 2004*, 289–299. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Szymanek, B. 1985. *English and Polish adjectives. A study in lexicalist word-formation*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Taylor, J. R. 1996. *Possessives in English. An exploration in cognitive grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Topolińska, Z. 1984. Składnia grupy imiennej. In Z. Topolińska (ed.), *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Składnia*, 301–386. Warszawa: PWN.
- Willim, E. 1999. On the syntax of the genitive in nominals: The case of Polish. In I. Kenesei (ed.), *Crossing boundaries. Advances in the theory of Central and Eastern European languages*, 179–210. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.